

Application No.: 10/694,471
Docket No.: FA1064USNA

Page 4

REMARKS**About the Amendments**

Claim 1 was amended to overcome the Examiner's objection to "equivalent-%", and to clarify that the amount of 3-15 equivalent % refers to the at least one dicarboxylic acid, i.e., the total of all species of dicarboxylic acid named therein. Claim 1 was also amended to address the Examiner's comments regarding lack of antecedent basis for the phrase "the acid equivalents". The amendments are not considered narrowing amendments, but are editorial amendments that serve to clarify the claim from confusion over Applicants' use of grammar. Support for the amendments can be found at page 7, in the first full paragraph.

Claim 5 was amended consistent with the amendment of Claim 1.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner recognizes allowable subject matter in Claims 1-8, but for the deficiencies – in the Examiner's view – cited in the present office action. Applicants thank the Examiner for noting the allowable subject matter, and suggested amendments to the claims.

Traversal**Claims 1-10 were restricted to Groups I and II.**

Applicants respectfully traverse the restriction requirement in view of the fact that Claim 9 and 10 claim a product obtained by a process that includes electrodeposition according to the process claimed in Claim 7, which is based upon use of the novel composition claimed in Claim 1. The process claimed is limited to an electrodeposition process, and the Examiner's reason for restriction ignores the claim language, particularly in view of the acknowledged allowable subject matter of Claims 1-8. Withdrawal of the restriction requirement is hereby requested.

Claim 1 was objected to for the recitation of "equivalent-%".

Claim 1 was amended to correct what amounts to a typographical error in the claim. The Applicants request that the objection be reconsidered in view of the amendment.